CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXVII No. 2 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* February, 1986

DISCRIMINATION BY ANY OTHER NAME

by NOEL HUNT

In the West, we are so accustomed to being lectured on the evils of racial separation or apartheid and assured that it is abhorrent above all else, that it comes as a shock to realise that not everyone in the world shares this viewpoint.

So constantly are we told that 'world opinion' condemns those who wish their race to remain unmixed, that the 'world community' (a purely notional figment of the liberal imagination) detests discrimination, we tend to accept this preposterous statement as true. So it is a shock when we hear of Australian blackfellows wishing to establish reservations exclusively for their own people. The Pope, it appears, has expressed sympathy with their desire. Surely, we feel, this demand must be condemned by 'the conscience of mankind' as the worst sort of apartheid, and thus as utterly evil? Strangely, not a word of censure for the blackfellows is heard.

Similarly, if we cast our minds back a few years we can recall that the moment British rule in India was lifted the Hindus and the Muslims set about each other. They slaughtered one another by the ten thousand and only ceased when they had divided themselves into two distinct countries, India and Pakistan. The dust had settled on this lake of blood but a few years when a fresh struggle erupted and there emerged the state of Bangladesh — another international mendicant and even less likeable than the Indian. Yet there was not a word of condemnation anywhere for this Asiatic desire to live apart . . . nothing but tolerant understanding. There was general understanding, too, that by way of amends for his 'wicked colonialist past' the white man was to be allowed to provide in perpetuity vast amounts of aid to keep these parvenu states in existence.

Apparently, it is quite in order for the coloured races to dislike each other. *They* are never pilloried 'at the bar of world opinion' for beliefs and actions which 'affront the conscience of mankind'. That unhappy fate seems reserved, by common consent, for the white man alone.

The English talking classes have always been quick to condemn any show of racial intolerance on the part of the native English. So we might have expected that when the black immigratnts in our midst showed unmistakably that they wished to have exclusively black sections in the trade unions, together with black Members of Parliament, they would have been loudly condemned by all the great and the good. Not pilloried 'at the bar of world opinion' or held to have affronted 'the conscience of mankind', being pretty well immune from criticism, but at least a gentle reproof might have been in order. In fact, there was nothing of the sort. Yet exclusively black sections in a union can be nothing but the most blatant of racial discrimination. In the eyes of the British liberal, such discrimination is a worse sin even than cigarette smoking! Yet no talking head appeared on the 'box' to tell us that black unionists were no better than white South Africans. No man of good will or trendy cleric called for sanctions against the black sections of the unions. One wonders why? If it is intolerable in South Africa, why is it tolerable in England? If it is tolerable here, why is in intolerable in South Africa?

America's Hypocrisy

America, of course, is one of the greatest advocates of racial mixture. Her incessant claptrap about "regardless of race, creed or colour" probably has been as successful as similar mindless clichés in Britain spreading misery round the world. So it is strange, indeed, to see the Senate of Arizona voting to set aside a separate area in the State for occupation by the Apache and Navajo peoples. No nasty Caucasoids may live in this area, which is to be called Dine (meaning "The People") — just the Mongaloid Indians. Evidently, the term "people" is not seen by the Indians as extending to Whites.

This seems indistinguishable from the South African homelands policy which has led to so much denunciation and provided so much useful publicity for so many. So one would expect that both here and in America there would be loud condemnation of such open apartheid. Both the Indians themselves who want to be racially separate and the Senate which makes it possible seem equally blameworthy. Yet

there has been a deafening hush on the subject . . . except from some in the new Dine Country itself. The white liberal may not be able to tell the difference between a black man and a white. Things are different in Dine: there a Hopi Indian can tell the difference beween himself and a Navajo. The Hopi — who seem to be racialist and chauvinist to a most praiseworthy degree — are telling the Arizona Senate at the top of their voices that they will not be dominated in Dine by numerically superior Navajo. Not a word of reproof is heard from the 'world community' at this arrant display of racialism. The hullabaloo is deafening, however, when the white South African hesitates to allow himself to be dominated by the numerically superior blacks.

Yes, you may say, but none of these examples involve blacks. It is the Negro, we are told so frequently and at such length, who of all peoples most abhor even the smallest trace of racial discrimination. It is this hatred of discrimination, we are informed, which fuels the black struggle against the South African. It is the system of separate development of the races which the black man finds intolerable and it is this system with which he will have nothing to do.

Awkward Facts

So one is amazed to learn that there are a million and a half foreign blacks in South Africa. Of these, only about 350,000 are there legally. The presence of the rest is illegal. This means that about a million and a quarter blacks from all over Africa south of the Sahara have trekked up to thousands of miles — Africa is huge — with all the dangers and hardships which this entails simply so that they can become illegal inhabitants of a country whose system of apartheid they are said to detest! Furthermore, once inside the country and subjected to the hardships and injustices which we are told are inseparable from apartheid, they make every effort to stay there. The South African Government does not want them. In fact, every day of the year it deports 1,500 illelgals, and has done for years. Yet still they come. It is almost beyond belief. Our own tireless busybodies and self-chosen "spokesmen" for the blacks tell us endlessly that they hate apartheid above all things. And yet well over a million of them have chosen to live clandestinely in South Africa, resisting all attempts at ejection and repatriation. How can these facts be reconciled with what we are told the black man thinks and feels?

To the old African hand, the average black seems rather to be a hedonist than a masochist. Yet what other explanation than masochism will account for the illegal flood into South Africa? Unless, of course, the liberals are talking nonsense, as they so often do, when they allege that discrimination is detested. This seems the more likely explanation *(especially when one remembers the latest Zulu/Ponda bloody race war — Editor).*

Thanks to Russia's tireless meddling, ably supported by America and Britain, all the countries from which South Africa's black immigrants come have the blessing of freedom and independence, including unlimited Western aid. One wonders why they should flee in thousands from such Utopian conditions. Can it perhaps be that independence *is* the unmitigated disaster that many of us have long suspected? There is another possibility: that the black race do not feel any particular abhorrence for racial discrimination, that they regard it as natural, and that they merely play along with the rubbish about it talked in the West.

It seems, in fact, that only those who rule the West have any objection to racial separation or to discrimination on racial grounds. The rest of the world seems to accept it as a fact of life. So, of course, do the bulk of the British and American peoples. Yet so strong is the liberal grip on our affairs that we are never allowed to suspect that there is any other viewpoint than the official one. It seems clear that until we can freely admit that races and peoples differ, and then accept and plan for the results of these differences, we shall never solve our racial problems. While we pretend that all races everywhere are virtually the asme, we must expect racial strife. Carlyle was right when he wrote: *"Till cant cease, nothing else can begin."*

Read
SPEARHEAD
Edited by John Tyndall
Send 63p for a sample copy to:
P.O. BOX 446, LONDON SE23 2LS.

CUT AND THRUST

A pretty good *resumé* of the start of the row over the Westland helicopter company was given in the **Daily Telegraph** on January 17th by A. W. Worsdell, a research engineer at Westland. His letter reported that the Westland board approached the Government for assistance many months ago when it first became apparent that the company was in serious trouble. They were told to find their own solution to the problem, despite Government indecision over the AST 404 helicopter requirement being in no small measure responsible. The 'principled' Michael Heseltine was quoted as saying at this time that *he did not mind if the company went into liquidation.* Indeed, a week after the publication of Mr. Worsdell's letter, our old friend Dr. Kitty Little ventured to suggest in the same newspaper that Mr. Heseltine's refusal to order helicopters was "apparently an attempt to make Westland bankrupt, and so ensure that the nation would be without the means of manufacturing these essential defence items." Be he fool or knave, it is certainly true that the flamboyant Mr. Heseltine took very little interest in Westland until it became clear that the company's future could provide him with an excuse to produce a case against Mrs. Thatcher's high-handed style, of which he has long been critical.

Mr. Worsdell's letter continued: "The board began a search for a rescue package. British Aerospace were aprpoached, but refused to help. In fact, the only offer of assistance came from Sikorsky, with Fiat. It was not until the European manufacturers perceived a threat from this alliance that the rival rescue package was hastily put together, with help from Mr. Heseltine." The French group around which the European consortium centred was the one that so delightedly provided Argentina with Exocets and the technicians to use them in an attempt to maim our Navy during the Falklands war.

* * *

There is another consideration as far as the proposed European 'rescue' is concerned. Be nuclear weapons what they may, and whatever the potency of airborne divisions, the English Channel (the *Chunnel* apart) remains what it has always been — a major obstacle to invaders. France, however, could be overrun almost in a very short time. In the event of a Russian move westwards, France would not resist (if at all) more than a week before asking for a ceasefire. What happens then to the Continental components of joint engines of war, the Falklands war having proved the immense value of the helicopter in modern fighting? One wonders whether the matter has been given even a moment's thought.

But at the end of the day in the Westland affair, there is no greater case for allowing the company to go in with Sikorski-Fiat, however high grade and strategically safe the outfit might be. Of over--riding importance is that this vital national resource — it supplies 94 per cent of our military needs for helicopters for military use — should remain a wholly British concern and not the plaything of reckless and irresponsible politicians and a financial fraternity that transcends national frontiers. The fact that Mrs. Thatcher's Government, like all others since the war, embraces policies directly concerned with bringing about our eclipse as a national entity, suggests that our independent helicopter industry will be allowed to be destroyed in the same way that our aircraft industry (remember the jettisoning of the superb TSR-2) was almost completely obliterated in obedience to the orders of Washington and New York.

And hasn't the whole furore about Westland conveniently blown up to enable that other piece of treasonable folly, the Channel Tunnel, to slip by at a massive pace in record time?

* * *

There was up-to-the-minute evidence that Mother India is alive and well on Radio Four's **The World This Weekend** on January 12th when listeners were informed that there are thousands of cases of wife-burning in the sub-continent. Surprisingly, or perhaps not, so common an event rates no more than a snippet in the "other news items" in the press, and that is when it is reported at all. There is also great difficulty in getting the Indian Police to take any interest in such cases, apparently, and if they *are* involved they can be un-involved via a bribe, being very corrupt. But why wife-burning? Unsatisfactory dowries seem to be the motive. Why *burning,* though? It is easy to arrange without leaving any clues: the malevolent husband shoves her, sari-clad as she is, onto the kitchen cooker. We heard on the news an English-speaking neighbour tell how she heard screams, rushed round, and saw the unfortunate wife in flames running round in circles before collapsing, dead. The incident was reported to the Police, but they never came to take evidence. We also heard the voice, then translated, of a woman who had survived an attempt. She was pushed onto the flaming

gas-ring of her kitchen cooker, nevertheless managing *not* to be another "kitchen accident". Now, all this was heard quite clearly on a peak listening-time news programme on the BBC. Yet this institution is committed to the Establishment aim of a multi-*cultural* (!) Britain, isn't it? So what is happening?

Still via the BBC we heard what great importance the dowry plays (although illegal) in Indian marriages. But we don't remember an accompanying BBC allegation of *Western* materialism.

* * *

On the same one o'clock news programme evidence was given of how disastrous the International Monetary Fund is from the point of view of the poor of the Third World. Big development schemes are sponsored which are very profitable to the bankers but thrust upon umpteen thousands of the Third World countries' populations into a squalor undreamt-of even in an admittedly poor yesterday. The interviewee who was thus responsible for this 'J'Accuse' against the mega-bankers sounded as if he was Jewish. He took a swipe at some of the pernicious activities of the Western 'charities', too. However, he did not get his unprecedented hearing unopposed. An important Government spokesman, recently returned from an IMF confab, was wheeled on to assure listeners that the International Monetary Fund was indeed a caring, sharing, help the powerless, penniless, rural, Third World poor, organisation. There was not the slightest question of big-scale agriculture and big-scale Third World industrialisation being financed for the benefit of big-scale international money power. Perish the thought, declared Mrs. Thatcher's man! When, we wonder, will the 'radicals' of the Labour Party or SDP start condemning the IMF?

Being realists, we must content ourselves with waiting for ever for any spokesman of the Left to attack the power-masters of international finance. Both wings of the party game have long acquiesced, willingly or unwillingly, in the formulation and carrying out of policies designed to block individual nations' means of livelihood and make of them servile states and satellites of the new financial overlords who would exercise sole sovereign sway and masterdom. It was not always so. Our founder, A. K. Chesterton, recalled how during his school holidays shortly before the 1914-18 War he would spend frequent Sunday mornings listening to orators in the Robert Blatchford tradition holding forth in a South London park. What he particularly remembered were the constant harangues about the evils of international finance. After the war, except in some of the speeches of Colonel Cresswell, leader of the South African Labour Party, A. K. never once heard the phrase "international finance" used on a Labour platform, and as a young reporter both overseas and in Britain he had to attend enough political gatherings to come to realise that the term was definitely 'out' so far as Socialist speakers were concerned.

Now both Left and Right enthusiastically back supranational ramps like the International Monetary Fund, designed to lead to a One World monopoly of financial, economic, strategical and political power and dominated by the Wall Street wolf-packs. And they spare no energy in hounding those who break the conspiracy of silence concerning the power of international capital.

* * *

"Gay Peacock, 31, tired of sitting on his tail-feathers and being taken for just another turkey, seeks similar fun fowl (21+).

"Gay Boy 21/25, short statured, inexperienced? Sought by mature, overworked, overweight businessman, offering friendship and possible caring relationship."

Any magazine that carries a "lonely hearts" column with such miserable pleas from those unfortunates who live in the land of sexual twilight really ought not to be allowed on *any* book-stall, let alone those of a household names such as W. H. Smith. Instead of allowing the maladjusted to do what they have done for ages and live out their perverted private lives in private, it facilitates their making an insolent public cock of the snoot at society.

In addition to providing a means by which homosexuals might become joined together, the weekly magazine, **Time Out,** in its issue for January 23rd, carried what is presumably a regular feature listing a range of "gay" night-clubs and other 'dives' where the master-spirits of the age can compete *en masse.* We could not fail to notice, too, a feature urging readers to "be prepared to see at least twice" a homosexual film called **Before Stonewall** and subtitled (as an AIDS-memoire?!) "The Genesis of Lesbian and Gay America". The film's highlights are too many to mention, we were informed: "a cross-dressing [presumably transvestite] Harlem night-club singer . . . a soldier's memory of a tender, tragic encounter on a bridge in newly-liberated France . . ." Ugh!

There is not so much pathos as sheer aggression in such lobbying, and the stench is powerful enough for the strongest of nostrils. So we had little doubt that when **Time Out** decided to make "a special investigation into the new face of the ultra right", no impediment would restrain the pens of its sleuths. They were aided, inevitably, by the professional smear-mongers of **Searchlight.** There was all the usual cloak-and-dagger stuff about Ulster gunmen and Eyetie fascists: the whole pot-pourri of right-wing groups was mentioned, from the Tory fringe to the massed ranks of Column 88! and where **The Mail on Sunday** feared to tread, **Time Out** exercised some nimble foot-work in suggesting, but not quite stating, that instruction in "small arms and guerilla war tactics" took place at Forest House when the Academicians of the Young National Front spent a few weekends there during which by way of recreation they played soccer, sampling the local ales and yarned the hind-legs off innumerable donkeys around the camp-fire. Whatever shadowy figures lurk in the undergrowth at Forest House, they did not deter **Time Out's** two intrepid reporters from willingly imbibing *South African* sherry when they visited **Candour's** Editor on the afternoon of Saturday, December 7th!

* * *

Two drug-crazed young thugs, who plunged a broken bottle repeatedly into a Surrey licensee's face when he tried to throw them off his premises and then drove their car at another customer and trapped him by his legs, were given a mere five and six years' jail and youth custody respectively at the Old Bailey last month. The publican described the sentences as "a joke" and said, "The youngsters who are at my pub laugh and joke when they see these types of sentences handed out." Undoubtedly they do, for they know full well that with remission they will serve a lot less. By comparison, the licensee has lost an eye for the rest of his life. Nothing could do more to bring the administration of the law into disrepute than the travesties of justice that result in such ludicrously lenient treatment. As long as such derisive sentencing is perpetuated by the courts, we cannot hope for the climate of our times to change for the better.

* * *

FOR FAMILY, COUNTRY AND TRADITION!

A new book of the greatest interest and value to Candour readers

When Elizabeth, Lady Freeman, first sent her **TRADITIONALISTS' ANTHOLOGY** for me to read, she said that it was the collection she had made over the years in her commonplace book, and now the times being what they are, she would like to see it printed "for the sake of her grandchildren" .

In an earlier Dark Age, it was the monasteries that held and safeguarded the accumulation of wisdom and truth neglected — if not abhorred — by contemporary marauders. Today, when it appears that Shangri-la exists only in the imagination of James Hilton, everybody's grandchildren will probably have to search for it among the forgotten contents of attics and second-hand book-shops, but with minds loaded with Establishment lies, as to ever greater extent they will be, they will not know what to look for unless provided with a key. This anthology of Elizabeth Freeman's choice is just such a key. It contains a collection of gems so excellent in themselves that they "make hungry where most [they] satisfy."

If the miracle we pray for is delayed, and the spiritual and physical vandalism of nations continues, may our children's children find, learn from and profit by the treasures of truth exemplified in this timely strong-book.

Advance orders accepted now **Publication date: March 1986**

Price: £10 (U.K. $15 (U.S.A. £12.50 (Rest of the world)

THE RESPECTABLE MEN OF VIOLENCE

The 'men of violence' of the IRA and their political colleagues in Sinn Fein are regularly anathematised by all the pillars of the UK Establishment and also, needless to say, by the subsidiary Anglicanised 'Catholic' Establishment. Yet simultaneously [they] encourage and applaud other terrorists by comparison with whom the IRA 'men of violence' would seem to be knights in shining armour. Even now the IRA keeps its cadres in line simply by knee-capping or execution by shooting. Which means of enforcing discipline are exceptionally civilised by contrast with the favourite method of the African National Congress which appears to be highly esteemed by the Churchmen who anathematise the IRA.

The Necklace

For the ANC is at present seeking to make South Africa ungovernable by means of 'The Necklace', a truly horrendous method of assassination which to the best of our knowledge has never been publicised by the media in this country, despite its being so widely used. 'The Necklace' is a rubber tyre filled with petrol hung around the neck of any black who dares to co-operate in any way with the legitimate Government of the Republic of South Africa.

Yet notwithstanding the utter barbarism this implies — the burning alive of anyone who refuses to do the will of the ANC — even the most eminently respectable Churchmen in this country do not appear to regard such savagery as being in any way reprehensible. On the contrary, the General Synod of the Church of England recently gave a standing ovation to Dr. Beyers Naude, Secretary of the South African Council of Churches, who called upon the church to review their traditional opposition to violence at least concerning South Africa.

Guilty Silence

Be it noted that this does not appear to have occasioned a single word of protest from a single Catholic Bishop in these islands. On the contrary, Dr. Naude's appeal for a review of the traditional Christian opposition to violence was hailed in **The Universe** of November 25th, 1985, with a banner headline 'VIOLENCE CAN WORK, SAYS-CHURCHMAN'.* Yet on its front page **The Universe** boasts that it is the top selling religious newspaper in Britain and Ireland. Its report of Dr. Naude's address will, no doubt, be noted by the IRA.

*The representatives of these ANC murderers have lately been "rewarded" with a conference called in Zambia by parliamentarians of our own treasonable Government to vilify South Africa and bludgeon her into chaos. Ed.

CHUNNELLING TO OUR DOOM

(from **The Portsmouth News,** 13/1/86)

In an effort to drum up support for the unpopular EEC, Mr. Richard Simmonds, MEP, (The News, January 2) reveals perhaps the real reason for the Channel tunnel.

As a good "European" Mrs. Thatcher no doubt feels that she must demonstrate her loyalty to the Common Market despite the fact that most people do not think it worth voting for. The turn-out for Euro-elections is so low as to reduce the whole thing to the level of a farce! The so-called European Parliament, unlike the British one, has not evolved from the common political experience of our nation: it is an artificial entity.

The "Chunnel" will no doubt please the hard--line Euro-fanatics who desire a United States of Europe. This super-state would have a central bureaucracy remote from the common man, able to levy taxes and over-rule national laws in favour of its own. It would have its own flag, stamps and security arrangements. Such ideas are laid down in the Draft Treaty for Political Union and in the Dooge Report.

The EEC has not created or preserved jobs; it has destroyed them. It has failed to secure investment in the UK and wastes large amounts of food while people starve.

The philosopher C. H. Douglas once said, "The smaller the genuine political unit, the nearer we are to self-determination of the individual." The plans of the Euro-fanatics to create a United State of Europe in an effort to destroy the nation-state must be stopped. Albion arise!

GRAEME R. KEMP, Gosport.

Subscription Rates

	Per Annum	
U.K. - - -	£5.00	
Overseas - -	£6.00	Airmail
U.S. Dollar Rate -	$10.00	,,

FOREST HOUSE. LISS FOREST. HANTS GU33 7DD

APOLOGY IN MOROCCO

by FR. J. VIDA ELMER

On August 19th, 1985, during his short visit in Morocco, John Paul II made a bid to reopen a Catholic-Moslem dialogue. He urged both religions to "change our old habits" and put an end to the centuries-old animosity. In the Casablanca sport stadium, he said to 80,000 young male Moroccans: "We Christians and Moslems have generally failed to understand each other, and sometimes in the past have been in conflict, and have exhausted ourselves in arguments and war." He said, "I believe that God is inviting us today to change our old habits."

This short quotation reveals several things in the mind of the speaker. First of all, the tone of the whole speech treated the two religions on an equal level. Secondly, the expression "in the past" is a convenient cover-up for the history of a centuries-old life-and-death struggle in the defence of the Catholic faith, and belittles that struggle by claiming that it was a result of misunderstanding, which deserves a virtual apology on the part of Catholics.

In that "past" Christian Europe had to fight a long and deadly war against the Mohammedan Empire, which threatened the very existence of Christianity. Without those wars, sacrifices and victories, no Christian Europe or America would exist today. But John Paul II apologised for such a past.

Dialogue Or Missionary Zeal?

From the beginning, the Catholic Church has been a missionary Church motivated by the mandate of Our Lord: "Go to the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature." It was not a "dialogue", but this missionary zeal which spread the Church over all the world. It has brought civilisation, science and a higher standard of living to the people of backward countries. (It is an irony of history that today some of those countries regard their Christian white populations as undesirable elements.)

The Conciliar leaders *(the Church since Vatican II — Editor)* simply do not understand why it is so important to gain converts. Their mode of thinking is: "If we can have a dialogue with non-Catholic people, and achieve coexistence by watering down Catholic teaching, why should we molest them by proclaiming the truth, and urging them to seek and find the divine truth in the Catholic Church? By doing this, we can cause them embarrassment, humiliation, and even provoke hostility and wars." To the Conciliar mind, millions of Christians could have saved their lives by offering a "dialogue" to unbelievers.

So what can we see today in the Conciliar Church? Apology for the missionary work of the past. Apology for the existence of Christianity. The Mohammendans *exterminated* the flourishing early Christian communities in North Africa. Was it only out of "misunderstanding"? Then they invaded Catholic Spain, and kept it under their rule for many centures. When finally they withdrew from Spanish territory, it was not the result of "dialogue" but the persuasion of the sword in the hands of Christian kings!

In 1453, the Otttoman Turks captured Constantinople, the capital of the Eastern Roman Empire. This victory of the Turks put the Byzantine Empire out of existence, and opened the gates of Europe to an unlimited Mohammedan expansion. Throughout the following centuries, millions of Christians died either by cruel execution or on the battlefields while defending their faith and country.

The Moslems in a short period of time occupied the Balkans and the kingdom of Hungary by military force. They were determined to establish a Mohammedan Empire throughout the whole of Europe. Their naval power directly threatened also the Holy See, until the miraculous victory of Christian forces at Lepanto on October 7th, 1572, under the reign of Pope St. Pius V, gained relief from this threat. If at the time the popes of the Church and the heads of Christian states had offered only a "dialogue" against the Mohammedan invasion, today there would be no Christian Europe and no Christian America. Of course, there would be no need for an apology on the part of John Paul II for the survival of Christianity, either.

It is preposterous to say that the popes of that time "failed to understand" the true nature of Mohammedanism. It is only the apologetic attitude of the Conciliar Church which regards those wars of self-defence as a waste of life and property caused by "misunderstanding". ,

In 1456, the huge army and naval forces of Mohammed II laid siege to Belgrade, and were ready to march across Hungary towards Western Europe. It was Janos Hunyady, the brilliant Hungarian commander, who stopped the Turks at the southern gates of the country. Janos Hunyady and his soldiers went into the battle with sword in their hands and

the name of Jesus on their lips. Thousands of them died in that fierce battle, but by their heroic sacrifice they inflicted a decisive defeat on the Turkish fleet in the Danube River, and on the army of Mohammed II on the land, and ended the siege of Belgrade. By this victory Christian Europe gained a seventy-year respite from the Turkish expansion.

In 1526, however, the Turks came back stronger than ever and defeated the Hungarian army at Mohacs. Twenty thousand soldiers, several bishops and the king himself (Louis II) were killed in that battle, which then enabled the Turkish army to occuy a large segment of Hungary, including its capital Buda (now Budapest). In the following years of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Turkish expansion moved towards Western Europe.

At that time the popes of the Church were busy — not offering dialogues but erecting armies and fleets against the deadly enemy. If Christianity exists today, it is only through the grace of God and the innumerable martyrs who died in those wars for faith and country. This is just a short glimpse of that bloody part of history that John Paul II conveniently covers with the expression: misunderstanding of the past.

Mohammedan Expansion

The vocation of each and every pope is to spread the Gospel and convert people. There was absolutely no indication that John Paul II was aware of such a mission during his visit in Morocco.* At least he could have offered to the Moslems a common front and co-operation against Communism, which is an enemy of all God-centred religions. Nothing of that sort happened. In fact, John Paul II has never explicitly condemned Communism.

Another aspect of the Mohammedan expansion is the fact that it did not fade away into the oblivion of history, as many would think. The means and tools of the expansion drive have changed. In the past, the Moslems used the power of their armies and thundering cannons. Today they use the massive numerical and money power. Moslems come to the West and are erecting their mosques in Christian cities (Rome included) in an ever-increasing number.

Any Catholic leader who does not see a danger in this is a blind leader, because he does not know the "signs of the times". Any Christian leader who wishes us to see in Mohammedanism just another religion is leading us "into the pit".

*Or during his more recent visit to India. Ed.

BEN'S APOLOGY

It is regretted taht there was an error in the original review of "The Fairy Queen". The Editor apologises to the author, Mr. Dewi Hopkins. The following is, with due correction, a complete reprint.

SWEET AND SOUR

Clearly there will be no Spenserian-type pension from the second Elizabeth on account of this "Fairy Queen".* Unless, of course, our present monarch be as fed up with Petticoat Government as is — barring certain privileged imports — the rest of the British

Unlike Spenser's epic, in Hopkins' poem 'interpretation' is quite unnecessary: and it has little or no adulation towards its target. Fairly plain, the message: Mr. Hopkins approves not of Mrs. T. Similarly, I cannot approve this author's dig at — perhaps — a long suffering and gentle Mr. T., who may well deserve our sympathy!

The poem scans beautifully. It also has a sour/sweet touch towards its vicim, which is how many of us view our Prime Minister.

A neat tribute — for I am sure that the Iron Lady laps us such attention as 'complimenent' — but for me the meaningful measure is contained in the last verse:

Placemen who dance with dainty-tripping tread —
While three hobgoblins hobble at her side
To reinforce her errors and misguide
Her feet.

***The Fairy Queen** by Dewi Hopkins. 25p including postage from Guild of St. George, 17 Hadassah Grove, Lark Lane, Liverpool L17 8XH.

B. E. BIGGS.

That brave young patriot **Joe Pearce,** of the National Front, is now serving a year behind bars, but his spirit is unbroken. We urge *every single subsciber* to send him some words of encouragement and cheer. Please write to: L25819 Pearce, HMP Standford Hill, Eastchurch, Sheerness, Kent.

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.